

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 4, 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alSafadi et al. (USPN 6,467,088, hereinafter “alSafadi”), in view of Henson et al. (USPN 6,167,383, hereinafter “Henson”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over alSafadi in view of Henson. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of alSafadi and Henson teaches having **the reconfiguration manager** determine, based upon a list, a configuration to approve and order (download) (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 34-45).

In contrast, the present invention determines a plurality of memory options, presents the plurality of memory upgrade options to a user of the computer system, **allows the user to select a memory upgrade**, and, upon approval, orders the memory upgrade option (see page 9, line 26 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides control to the user to select and authorize the upgrade.

There is nothing within alSafadi or Henson, either separately or in concert, which suggests determining a plurality of memory options, presenting the plurality of memory upgrade options to a user of the computer system, allowing the user to select a memory upgrade, and, upon approval, ordering the memory upgrade option.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention determines a plurality of memory options, presents the plurality of memory upgrade options to a user of the computer system, allows the user to select a memory upgrade, and, upon approval, orders

the memory upgrade option. These amendments find support on page 9, line 26 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: March 1, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665